



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

confined in the Special Introduction almost altogether to two things, the analysis and statement of the contents of the various books, and the effort to fix the dates of their origin. Other aspects of the Old Testament literature which well repay attention are practically ignored. But to the student who does not expect too much, this book may be highly recommended. It represents points of view not sufficiently familiar to English readers, and should commend itself to them by its fairness and freedom of spirit, its scientific method, and its essential sanity. As a companion volume to Driver's *Introduction*, it will be found eminently useful; but it can never displace Driver in the hands of the thorough student. The translation has been well done; it reproduces the original faithfully and also constitutes idiomatic English.

J. M. P. S.

---

**The Bible under Trial.** By REV. JAMES ORR, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1907. Pp. viii + 323. Second edition. Pp. 323. \$1.75.

This volume is made up of a series of papers prepared, the author says, "in response to urgent request as a popular apologetic series in defense of the Bible from the attacks made on it from different quarters." The papers are twelve in number. Some of the titles to these papers, but not all, give a good idea of the scope of the book, e. g., I. "The Present Day Trial of the Bible," III. "'Presuppositions' in Old Testament Criticism," IV. "'Settled Results' in Criticism," VI. "Archaeology as Searchlight," IX. "Oppositions of Science," XI. "Discrepancies and Difficulties."

The author's point of view is clearly brought out: he regards virtually all modern criticism as an attack upon the Bible. If the critic studies the book of Deuteronomy, for instance, and reaches the conclusion that it is a Mosaic production to which a later hand has added the story of the death of the great lawgiver (chap. 34), and possibly other minor matters here and there, he might be crowned with the honorable title *defensor fidei*. But should his verdict be that the book was produced in the age of Josiah to serve as the programme of his reformation, then his work becomes hostile to the Bible, and is to be opposed by all believers. If one studies the establishment of the kingdom (I Sam., chaps. 8-12), to take a case of a different kind, and recognizes two original sources, but so combined as to be complementary and thus tell the whole story, and nothing else, that criticism is legitimate. But should the student venture to declare that the accounts are independent and in part contradictory, then he must be classed among

the assailants of Holy Writ. That is to say, criticism cannot justify itself by purpose or by method, but only by results. The author has no objection, apparently, to critical methods, and is willing to accept, somewhat grudgingly to be sure, some of the results, such as the analysis of the Pentateuch; but wherever the results go beyond his acceptance, then the danger signal is raised. Apologetics certainly occupies a very prominent place in this treatise.

The critics will surely deny the hostile purpose with which they are charged, and they will dissent from the inference about their conclusions. It is probably true that the honest critic is unhampered by apologetic presuppositions; his object, however, is surely not to attack the Bible, but only to find out the truth about the character and origin of the books of which it is composed. There is nothing of hostility in his quest for truth. He has no desire to destroy, and as a matter of fact he never conceives that his work is an attack on the Bible, but only upon erroneous views about the Bible. To illustrate: some ancient Jewish higher critic studied the Fifty-first Psalm. He came to the conclusion that it was written by David after Nathan had opened his eyes to the gross crime he had committed. Dr. Briggs has also studied this ancient poem and judges it to be a penitential prayer of the time of Nehemiah. Now, Dr. Briggs may be right or wrong, and his work may be easily construed as an assault upon the conclusion of his Jewish predecessor, but one searches the pages of his exposition in vain to find a word that savors of an attack upon the psalm itself.

Again, the black beast of modern criticism to Dr. Orr and to many like-minded is the post-exilic date of the priestly law. No critical result has been assailed so vigorously as this. It is attacked generally on the ground that it is dangerous, not that it is a conclusion contrary to the evidence. It is regarded as one of the most pernicious assaults upon the Bible. Why? Is it perilous to suppose that God had his inspired speakers and writers in the post-exilic period? Would the assailants of this result be more likely to obey this law if all would agree that its composition was pre-exilic? This law is a dead letter in Christianity; it was pretty completely discarded by St. Paul; why should any particular date for its origin be other than a question of archaeological interest?

What is much to be desired in the way of an apologetic book on the Bible is a treatise showing that should the critics be right in what may be regarded as their most extreme contentions, the value of the Bible as a record of God's revelation to man is not impaired in the slightest degree. The volume before us is far enough from meeting that need. There is

too much timidity, and there is not enough of sweet reasonableness. The author so often states what he considers perilous teaching and then brushes it aside by a mere wave of the hand, that is, by saying that he does not accept it. The mere denial of a critical or scientific position will scarcely suffice to put it out of countenance.

Dr. Orr has a great tendency to take untenable positions, at the same time assuming that he is resting on the unmistakable authority of Holy Writ. In his treatment of science he says, "I accept for myself what I take to be the plain teaching of Scripture, that man, made in God's image, was the *last* of the Creator's works" (p. 215, italics mine). So we might all say if we had only Gen., chap. 1. But Gen., chap. 2, is also in the Bible, and there it is stated that man was created *first*. Now we may easily hold that man was created *last*, but how we can stake our belief on the plain teaching of Scripture is incomprehensible. The reader wonders how Dr. Orr can rest so confidently in his position. He finds the explanation after many pages, that Gen., chap. 2, "is not, in strictness, an account of the creation at all" (p. 261). That chapter describes the creation of man, of the trees which Jahveh made to grow out of the ground, and of every beast of the field and bird of heaven. It is difficult to see why this is not "an account of the creation." Denying facts can scarcely be regarded as a satisfactory explanation of difficulties.

The best paper is that on ethics (No. X). The author has not allowed apologetic interests to run away with his clear moral insight. Bad ethical teaching is recognized as such, and bad ethical practice is never justified because it was the act of a venerated hero like Abraham or David.

L. W. BATTEN

ST. MARK'S CHURCH  
New York City